E435
.W53
copy 2

E435
.W53
Cel-12

WHO ARE SECTIONAL?

BY GEORGE M. WESTON.

U. S. A.

It is objected to the Republican party, that its candidates for both the Presidency and Vice Presidency are taken from the North; that it exists, as an effective organization, only in the free States, and will present electoral tickets in only two or three slave States; that its triumph would be a sectional triumph of the North over the South; and that its success will be equivalent to a dissolution of the Union, because the slave States will certainly not submit to it, and perhaps ought not to submit to it. This objection, already taken in many quarters, has received the special endorsement of one who has filled the highest position in our Government. Mr. Fillmore, in the many addresses he has delivered to his fellow-citizens, who have assembled at various places to welcome his return from Europe, has made this his capital, most emphatic, and, indeed, most fatal objection to the Republican party. At Albany, Mr. Fillmore said:

"We see a political party presenting candi-
'dates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency,
'selected for the first time from the free States
'alone, with the avowed purpose of electing
'these candidates by suffrages of one part of
'the Union only, to rule over the whole United
'States. Can it be possible that those who are
'engaged in such a measure can have seri-
'ously reflected upon the consequences which
'must inevitably follow, in case of success?
'[Cheers.] Can they have the madness or the
'folly to believe that our Southern brethren
'would submit to be governed by such a Chief
'Magistrate? [Cheers.] Would he be required
'to follow the same rule prescribed by those
'who elected him in making his appointments?
'If a man living south of Mason and Dixon's
'line be not worthy to be President or Vice
'President, would it be proper to select one
'from the same quarter, as one of his Cabinet
'Council, or to represent the nation in a foreign
'country? Or, indeed, to collect the revenue,
'or administer the laws of the United States?
'If not, what new rule is the President to adopt
'in selecting men for office, that the people
'themselves discard in selecting him? These
'are serious but practical questions, and, in
'order to appreciate them fully, it is only ne-
'cessary to turn the tables upon onrselves.
'Suppose that the South, having a majority of
'the electoral votes, should declare that they
'would only have slaveholders for President
'and Vice President, and should elect such by
'their exclusive suffrages to rule over us at the
'North. Do you think we would submit to it?
'No, not for a moment. [Applause.] And do
'you believe that your Southern brethren are
'less sensitive on this subject than you are, or
'less jealous of their rights? [Tremendous
'cheering.] If you do, let me tell you that you
'are mistaken. And, therefore, you must see
'that if this sectional party succeeds, it leads
'inevitably to the destruction of this beautiful
'fabric, reared by our forefathers, cemented by
'their blood, and bequeathed to us as a price-
'less inheritance."

Undoubtedly, the practice has been common, in selecting candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency, to take one from the free States and the other from the slave States, but the practice has been by no means uniform; and when Mr. Fillmore undertook to say that what had been done by the Philadelphia Convention had been done "*for the first time*," he exhibited a strange ignorance of, or total inattention to, the history of the country. In the election of 1828, one of the parties presented General Jackson, of Tennessee, for the Presidency, and Mr. Calhoun, of South Carolina, for the Vice Presidency; while the other party presented Mr. Adams, of Massachusetts, for the Presidency, and Mr. Rush, of Pennsylvania, for the Vice Presidency; and the last-named ticket doubtless received the support of Mr. Fillmore himself.

At the preceding election, that of 1824, the votes were not divided between two parties, but

E435
.W53
Copy 2

scattered upon many candidates. However, of 261 votes thrown for President, 177 were given to Southern men, and of 260 votes thrown for Vice President, 221 were given to Southern men, so that, in most of the States, the votes must have been given to candidates from the South for both offices.

In 1836, the candidates of the Whig party were General Harrison, of Ohio, for the Presidency, and Mr. Granger, of New York, for the second office, except in Massachusetts, which supported Mr. Webster for the Presidency, and Mr. Granger for the second office. Mr. Fillmore, undoubtedly, voted the Harrison and Granger ticket. At the same election, South Carolina voted for Mangum, of North Carolina, for President, and Tyler, of Virginia, for the second office. At the same election, Georgia and Tennessee voted for Judge White, of Tennessee, for President, and Tyler, of Virginia, for the second office. It is not recollected that any of the individuals, or parties, or States, concerned in these transactions, were charged with the design of overthrowing the Union.

Mr. Bright, of Indiana, has been elected President of the present Senate, in the place of Vice President King, deceased. Mr. Bright is therefore, to all intents and purposes, Vice President of the United States, performs the present duties of that office, and would succeed to the first office, upon the same contingencies as would a Vice President elected by the people. We now have, therefore, both the President and Vice President from the free States—the very thing pronounced by Mr. Fillmore to be so unprecedented and so dangerous. Or does Mr. Fillmore hold that to be unlawful, when proposed to be done by "*Black Republicans*," which is entirely lawful when done by anybody else?

Mr. Fillmore is equally at fault in suggesting, either that Col. Fremont would ostracise Southern applicants for office, provided they possess the Jeffersonian qualifications, or that Southern men would refuse to take office under him. The prediction may safely be ventured, that enough men from Virginia alone will be on their knees to Colonel Fremont for office, to exhaust all his patronage. Mr. Fillmore's own experience should have enlightened him on that point. Nobody knows better than he does, what vast numbers of his old Abolition associates were transformed into impassioned Union-savers, by the golden touch of patronage. The incumbent of the Presidency, be he who he may, or conduct as he may, will always have as many supporters as he can comfortably provide for.

The assumption that the slave States must have the candidate for the Presidency or Vice Presidency upon every ticket, can only be justified by assuming, contrary to the fact, that they compose one-half of the nation. Now, in round numbers, of the nineteen millions of free persons in the United States, by the census of 1850, thirteen millions, or more than two thirds, resided in the free States, and this disproportion is constantly and rapidly increasing. Allowing for the slaves of the South, according to the rule of the Federal Constitution, and the preponderance of the free States is still in the proportion of 144 to 90, or more than three fifths. The slave States do not constitute one-half of the nation, either in numbers, wealth, or any legitimate element of political power.

But is it true, in point of fact, on any fair view of things, that the Philadelphia Convention did select both its candidates from the North? Colonel Fremont was born in Georgia, was reared and educated in South Carolina, and had married the daughter of a Missouri slaveholder. He is Southern in origin, training, and association. When, and how, and where, did he become a Northern man? Certainly, not by his residence in California. That State is on neither side of Mason and Dixon's line, for the simple reason that that line was never run so far west. Our Pacific Territories constitute a distinct political system of their own. They are totally disconnected, and must ever remain so, from the sectional division of the Atlantic States. That division appeals neither to their interests nor their passions. Distance of space has the same effect in producing impartiality as distance of time. It has been said that the contemporaneous judgment of the United States upon European events, is as much to be relied upon as the judgment of posterity. Our Pacific coast is nearly three times as distant, in time of communication, as are France and England. The States which will arise on the Pacific may hereafter become the umpires of the Republic. They belong neither to the North nor the South, in any sense which can connect them with our controversies, either for principle or for power. They have independent objects of their own, and will always pursue their own peculiar systems of politics.

It is true that California is a free State, but its political associations have been steadily with the slave States. With the exception of the brief term of Colonel Fremont in the United States Senate, California has sent no man to either House of Congress, who has not gone with those who went farthest in the support of Slavery. At this moment, that State is confidently relied upon to vote for Mr. Buchanan, the Southern candidate for the Presidency. California, although not itself afflicted with Slavery, has been, in short, Pro-Slavery. At any rate, it has not been Anti-Slavery. It is not an "*Abolitionized*" State, as Southern gentlemen would say that Massachusetts is. Residence in California affords no proof, and raises no presumption even, of hostility to the peculiar institutions of the South.

In truth, the real point of the objection to the Republican nominations, which Mr. Fillmore has embodied in his Albany address, is

not to the residence of the candidates, but to the issues raised, and to the sectional location of the strength relied upon to elect those candidates. If the Republican party had nominated Francis P. Blair, of Maryland, for the Presidency, and Cassius M. Clay, of Kentucky, for the Vice Presidency, the opposition of the South would have lost none of its keenness, and the apprehensions of a dissolution of the Union entertained by Mr. Fillmore would not have been one whit less gloomy. Indeed, it is quite probable that as the Pierces, the Shannons, the Douglases, and the Buchanans, are more detested in the free States than any Southern men holding the same opinions, and pursuing the same policy, so, in the slave States, the Blairs and the Clays would be more obnoxious than even the Wades and Wilsons of the North. No! The real objection is not to the local residence of the Republican candidates. The objection to Colonel Fremont is not that he was born in Georgia, educated in South Carolina, married into the family of a Missouri slaveholder, and now has his residence and interests in a State on the Pacific, which is in no way involved in the sectional disputes of the Atlantic States; the objection is, that he is the candidate of the seventeen free States, against Mr. Buchanan, the candidate of the fourteen slave States. The objection is, that the party which supports Colonel Fremont is, in reference to the location of its strength, bounded by a geographical line; and that its success would be the triumph of one section over another.

In this division of the States, Delaware is reckoned as a free State. It ought to be so reckoned, in reference to the issues involved in the present contest. Delaware has a little lingering remnant of Slavery, but has long prohibited the exportation of slaves. Delaware has no interest in slave-breeding or Slavery extension, but is opposed to both. During the pendency of the Wilmot Proviso controversy, the Legislature of Delaware instructed their Senators in Congress to obtain, if possible, the prohibition of Slavery in the territories of the United States. The interests, opinions, and sentiments, of Delaware, are all hostile to the extension of Slavery. The Republican party exists there in full vigor, and if Col. Fremont loses the vote of the State, it will only be in consequence of the disturbing element of Americanism.

I do not affect to deny that the spectacle of the seventeen free States arrayed against the fourteen slave States, which is substantially the aspect of the pending Presidential contest, is one to be contemplated with profound concern. I owe it to the candor with which I desire to discuss all political questions, and to the intelligence of those to whom this paper is addressed, to admit that the existing condition of things is most undesirable and most deplorable. Is it remediable?—and if so, by whom? Are the free States responsible for this condition of things, or can they, consistently with their principles and convictions, do anything which will put an end to it?

A difference of opinion, broad, deep, and irreconcilable, in reference to the institution of Slavery, exists in the country. It is not an old difference of opinion, but a modern difference of opinion. It has arisen quite within the recollection of men in middle life. The free States, still holding fast to the views of all the fathers of the Republic, North and South, regard Slavery as morally wrong, politically dangerous, and, in an economical point of view, wasteful, exhausting, and ruinous. With such opinions, long cherished and clearly immovable, the free States cannot consent to the extension of Slavery over the Territories of the Union. On the other hand, the slave States have, of late, adopted the opinion that the institution of Slavery is both abstractly right and economically advantageous. They believe, or affect to believe, that its extension is for the general good, and, at any rate, essential to their own interest. Here is a case of irreconcilable difference of opinion between the two sections of the country. Regret it as much as we may, here it is; and what is to be done about it? Is there really any other solution of it, than that which is the solution of all other questions under republican forms of government—the submission of the minority to the fairly-expressed will of the majority? Is any other solution of it possible, or would any other solution of it be submitted to? Is it seriously proposed, that seventeen States shall yield to fourteen States; that thirteen millions of people shall yield to six millions?

Clearly, the minority must submit. The only alternative to it (viz: compromise) is now impossible. That was resorted to in 1820, when the Territories were divided by a parallel of latitude. But the South effaced that line in 1854, and still oppose its restoration. Compromise being impossible, nothing remains but the arbitrament of power, to be exercised peacefully and fairly, according to the forms and principles of the fundamental compact which constitutes us one nation. The Government is strong enough, the Union is strong enough, to bear the strain of even such a struggle as this, deeply as the necessity for it is to be regretted. But if the event should prove otherwise, and if, in truth, the minority of the Union will leave it if they cannot rule it, the path of duty is not less clear. The majority have no moral right to abdicate their power; they are responsible to themselves, to the world, and to posterity for the intelligent, well-considered, and firm exercise of it.

In respect, however, to this apprehended threatened dissolution of the Union by the South it is the stalest, the poorest, and the palt pretext of American politics. From what other quarter of the compass a dissoluti

the Union may come, it will never come from the South; it will never come from States whose peculiar institution renders them incapable of a separate and independent existence. The maintenance of a self-sustained power among the nations of the earth is impossible with any people weakened, cankered, and demoralized, by Negro Slavery. The two things cannot co-exist. No example of it can be found, in the long history of that institution. The nearest approach to an exception is the case of Brazil; and that is an instance, not of independence achieved, but of dominions divided between two branches of a reigning family. Negro Slavery is essentially a colonial institution; it has always existed in colonies, or, as in our Southern States, under conditions enabling it to draw protection from the power and vigor of free communities. The elder Quincy informs us, that when Mr. Calhoun spoke, in 1820, of a withdrawal of the Southern States from the Union as a possible event, it was with a view to a subsequent *connection with Great Britain.* The same thing was openly proclaimed the other day at the Capitol, by one of the Senators from Kentucky, Mr. Thompson.

Not only is this threat of a dissolution of the Union, by the South, a groundless, an idle, and even a ludicrous pretext; it is even more, and worse! It is defiance and insult! If the fourteen slave States will not submit, who is to submit? Is the majority to submit? Are the seventeen free States, with more than two-thirds of the free people of the country, to be dragooned into obedience? The South refuses all compromise. The lists are closed. There must be a clear victory for the one side or for the other. The one party, or the other, must go to the wall. The rule of the majority is republican, and can be submitted to without dishonor. We submit to it every day of our lives. The rule of the minority is tyranny, in every circumstance which can define tyranny, and nobody but a poltroon will succumb to it. The Government we live under deserves all our affections and all our support, but only because it reflects, or can be made to reflect, the fairly and constitutionally expressed will of the majority of the people. Whenever it comes to be controlled by menaces of revolution and secession from minorities, it will represent only those who can threaten the loudest. That day is, happily, far distant.

Be the issue of existing collisions of opinion what it may, it is an inestimable moral advantage to the North, that it stands upon doctrines common to the whole country when the Constitution was formed. The North has adopted no new opinions, and proposes no new policy. When the slave States formed the existing Union, they did it voluntarily, and with the full knowledge that the free States abhorred the institution of Slavery, and would not permit its extension. The Ordinance of 1787 is an imperishable monument, which attests to posterity the opinions of the framers of the Government. It is the South, and not the North, which has seen new lights, and proposes innovations upon the principles of our political partnership.

It is said that there is an important difference in the position of the two parties now contending for the Executive power; that the Southern party, the party whose object is the extension of Slavery, the party supporting Mr. Buchanan for the Presidency, has friends and allies and supporters in all the free States; and that, on the other hand, the Northern party, the party opposed to the extension of Slavery, the party supporting Colonel Fremont for the Presidency, has no friends, allies, or supporters, in the slave States. It is said, in short, that the Southern party is national, because it is enabled to present an electoral ticket in all the States, and that the Northern party is sectional, because, with exceptions not important, it presents electoral tickets only in the free States. This statement of the case is specious and plausible, but will not bear examination.

We have, in the first place, the most indubitable facts to satisfy us that very large numbers of the free people of the South dislike the institution of Slavery, and are opposed to its extension. Five-and-twenty years ago, it was the declared opinion of ninety nine in every hundred in the slave States, that the institution is an unmitigated curse. As late as 1832, this was the almost unanimous voice of Virginia. Mr. Clay, the trusted leader of Kentucky, maintained this view to his dying day. The contrary view was originally confined to a little coterie of politicians surrounding Mr. Calhoun. It is an exhalation from the bogs and fens and swamps of the tide-water region of South Carolina. We have with our own eyes seen this exhalation, dark, murky, and disastrous, rise and spread, until it has obscured the whole Southern horizon. As those who saw black clouds gather in the heavens, and veil the luminary of day, would still not doubt its existence, and would still believe that it would again, in due time, gladden the earth with its undiminished and untarnished lustre; so we, who can remember what Southern opinions were, and with our own eyes have marked the origin and progress of the cloud which has obscured them, may have undoubting confidence that they still exist, and will again assert their power.

It is impossible, in the nature of things, that, within the limits of one single generation of men, the unanimous condemnation of Slavery by the South should be changed into a unanimous approbation of it. All appearances of present unanimity in favor of Slavery are palpably fictitious. They are brought about by a reign of terror, which has muzzled the press and silenced free speech. In most of the slave States, nobody, except at the peril of life, is permitted to speak on the subject of Slavery, unless he speaks

in a particular way. A member of the Legislature of Texas, having this summer expressed the opinion that Congress has the power to prohibit Slavery in the Territories, was admonished by a public meeting in Galveston, that the utterance of such sentiments would not be tolerated in that city. The other day, in Virginia, within less than one hundred miles of the Capital of the Union, a Mr. Underwood was admonished that he would no longer be permitted to reside in the State, his offence being that he attended the Convention in Philadelphia which nominated Col. Fremont for the Presidency. It is perfectly monstrous to talk about the unanimity of the South under such circumstances. It is the unanimity of Poland, with the Russian knout brandished over it. It is the unanimity of Austrian Italy, under the administration of Marshal Radetsky. It is the unanimity of the subjects of despotic power the world over. Intelligent men will not believe that everybody at the South has fallen in love with an institution which they all deplored and lamented twenty-five years ago. A change of opinion, so sudden and universal, with not a single new fact to base a change of opinion upon, is not within the compass of possibilities. It needs very little examination to perceive that the present show of unanimity at the South in favor of Slavery, is a delusion and a sham, and the result of espionage, political and social ostracism, and downright brute violence.

There is one fact, about which there is no mistake, or possibility of mistake, which throws a flood of light upon the real state of opinion at the South; and that fact is, the direction of emigration from it. This light is not a deceptive light, broken up by a political prism, so as to make some objects look yellow, and others red, and others blue—but it is sunlight, streaming pure and serene from the god of day. Here is solid ground to stand upon. When men break up their residences, and leave the States in which they were born, with all the world before them where to choose, and with no practical limitation, except to keep within the range of the climates to which they are accustomed, they can choose freely between free and slave States; and the choice they make is a demonstration of preference which cannot be mistaken or gainsayed. Now, of the 838,387 persons who had left the border slave States, and who were living in other States, in 1850, 462,534 were found living in free States. And if allowance be made for the emigrants having slaves, and therefore obliged to move into slave States, it will be seen, that of the emigrants having liberty of choice, three fourths selected the free States. What was true of the emigration prior to 1850 is still true; and why should it not be so? Three fourths of the white persons of the South own no slaves, and are both injured and degraded by Slavery.

Everybody personally acquainted with the South, knows the fact to be just what these considerations would satisfy us it must be. There are thousands of persons, not blacks, but whites, in every Southern State, groaning under the tyranny which oppresses them, longing for relief, and yet without the means to strike the blow. The triumph of the Republican party, which would be the Waterloo of the Slave Oligarchy, would be hailed with delight by vast numbers, from Mason and Dixon's line to the Gulf of Mexico, who would leap forth into life, and light, and liberty, like captives released from their chains.

It may be true that no Fremont ticket will be run in most of the Southern States. There are very few election precincts at the South, where men who should presume to vote for Fremont would not incur a great hazard of having their throats cut. There is no such thing as law or liberty at the South, where the interests or passions of slaveholders are concerned. What the slaveholders of Missouri have done in Kansas, the slaveholders of Virginia, and of every other slave State, are ready to do this day, if occasion calls or passion prompts. The despotism of the slaveholders of the South is the most relentless, bloody, and infernal tyranny, which an inscrutable Providence ever permitted, for the affliction and punishment of mankind.

It is true that no Fremont ticket will be, or can be, run at the South, with the exception of three or four States, and that a Buchanan ticket will be run at the North; but this only proves that the North is civilized, governed by law, and tolerant even of flagrant political turpitude; while the slaveholders restrain outward dissent by the strong hand. No Committees of Vigilance have been raised in the free States, to banish, under pain of death, the men who attended the Cincinnati Convention—den of thieves, as Colonel Benton, an eye-witness, and a supporter of its candidates, describes it to have been, and abhorrent to the free States as were its principles and objects. The Southern party is permitted, without let or hindrance, to run a Buchanan ticket in every free State; but such a ticket will not receive in them any more votes than a Fremont ticket would receive at the South, if suffrage was free there, and if men could freely speak and write and print their genuine sentiments. At least as great a proportion of the people south of Mason and Dixon's line desire the election of Fremont, as can be found north of it in favor of Buchanan. If South Carolina is against Fremont, Massachusetts is against Buchanan, and with equal warmth and unanimity. If Mississippi is enthusiastic for Slavery-extension, Vermont is enthusiastic against it. If there is no Republican organization in many of the Southern States, it is simply because the slaveholders will not permit it. Ruling everything with the pistol, the bludgeon, and the bowie-knife, they now undertake to take advantage of their own wrongs, and to plead this sham, pretended,

and fictitious unanimity of the South, against Col. Fremont, as the crowning reason against his election. It is, in truth, one of the most persuasive arguments in his favor, because it is one of the most convincing proofs of the tyranny of an institution, the further spread of which it is the principal object of his election to defeat.

In Kentucky, where Cassius M. Clay has conquered free discussion, a Fremont electoral ticket has been formed, and will receive, it is admitted, not less than ten thousand votes. The city of St. Louis, the second city in the South, has just elected to Congress a Republican candidate, standing upon a Republican platform. In Maryland, the Republicans, who are numerous and influential, will form an electoral ticket, and poll a heavy vote for it. The numerous letters received by the Republican Association at Washington, from the far South, show how wide-spread and deep is the desire which exists there for the success of the Republican cause. It is only the apprehension of exposing the writers to ruffian violence, which restrains the publication of these letters, with names and dates. Even the organs of the slaveholders in the extreme South admit that Republicanism has a large and increasing number of adherents in their midst.

The *Mobile* (Ala.) *Advertiser* says:

"Well might the delegate in the late Black 'Republican Convention at Philadelphia argue, 'that so rapid would be the spread of Republi- 'can doctrines, that in four years they could, 'with impunity, hold their Conventions in Rich- 'mond, Virginia, or Lexington, Kentucky. 'Was there not good ground for the assurance, 'in view of the delegates in that body from 'Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, Tennessee, 'Kentucky, and District of Columbia? If he 'had known how many Black Republicans 'there were in this State and community, he 'might have moved to adjourn the Convention, 'to meet in 1860 at Montgomery. There are 'men here in Alabama, and in this county, who 'are not ashamed to own a preference to Fre- 'mont over Mr. Buchanan."

Conceding, however, to the slaveholders all they claim as to the condition of popular sentiment at the South, and their pretensions are still altogether inadmissible. In effect, they assume to control the Union, because they control the South. If they can make good this new doctrine of Mr. Fillmore, that no man shall be elected to the Presidency who cannot command Southern electoral votes, they become at once the acknowledged masters of the Republic. To the Jeffersonian qualifications for office—"*Is he honest? Is he capable? Is he faithful to the Constitution?*"—will be added a new one—"*Is he acceptable to the South?*"

The case is simply this: A difference of opinion, as to the administration of the Territories in a particular vitally affecting their destinies—a difference of opinion, broad, fundamental, not, to be sure, incapable of compromise, but in respect to which the South repudiates all compromise, exists between the free States on the one hand, and on the other hand, perhaps not a majority of the free people of the South, but the slaveholding interest, which practically controls and speaks for the South. Such a case admits of but one solution—the submission of the minority to the majority. The difference of opinion exists, not because the free States have adopted any new-light doctrines. They are abiding by the old doctrines of all the fathers of the country, North and South. The difference exists, because the South has adopted the new and modern vagaries of the South Carolina school. In exerting their power to prohibit Slavery in the Territories, the free States are only attempting an old application of an old principle; they are attempting nothing which can be said to be a surprise upon the Southern States, or in fraud of the principles and understandings, express or implied, upon which the Union was originally formed. They are attempting nothing which assails a single right of the Southern States. They meddle with no institution of the South, peculiar or otherwise. They abide by all the guarantees and compromises of the Constitution. Conscious of the high justice of their cause, they will move forward, undeterred by menace, coming from whatever quarter it may.

Mr. Fillmore's argument against the election of Colonel Fremont to the Presidency does not possess even the merit of originality. It is the identical argument used against the election of Mr. Banks to the Speakership of the United States House of Representatives. During two long months, on the floor of the House, and in still more violent language in the lobbies of the House, it was insisted that the election of a Speaker, who did not receive a solitary Southern vote, would destroy the Union, beyond a peradventure.

In the House, January 17, 1856, (*App. to Cong. Globe, page* 51,) Mr. Carlile, of Virginia, said:

"There is not a single gentleman voting for 'Mr. Banks, * * * who will rise in his 'place, and say that he has the slightest hope 'of obtaining a single vote for the gentleman 'from Massachusetts, from all that portion of 'the Confederacy lying south of Mason and 'Dixon's line. Surely, such an organization '* * * cannot claim to be national; and 'its success will, I fear, produce a state of 'feeling that will SHAKE THIS GLORIOUS 'UNION TO ITS VERY FOUNDATION."

This is a specimen of what they said in the House, every day, before Mr. Banks was elected. Even after the event, they could scarcely believe their own eyes, when they saw the walls of the Capitol still firm and solid. If the Union

was not dissolved, they did not believe it could long survive the shock.

In the House, March 11, 1856, (*App. to Cong. Globe, page* 136,) Mr. Wright, of Tennessee, said:

"My brief experience as a Representative ' has greatly increased my fears that our cher- ' ished system is *rapidly hastening to a prema- ' ture decay.*

"Why, what scenes have transpired within ' the past twelve months, and even since the ' meeting of this Congress? We have seen a ' great party built up in the North, overriding ' everything, whose opinions were purely sec- ' tional, whose watchwords were sectional. * * ' Strange as it may seem, and humiliating as it ' is, that party succeeded in getting power in ' this House; and you, sir, were chosen to pre- ' side over the deliberations of this body, *with- ' out having received a single vote, directly, ' south of Mason and Dixon's line.* * * I ' ask, sir, if these facts are not OMINOUS?"

What was the language addressed to the Southern Representatives by the Republican party, during the protracted and ever-memorable contest which terminated in the election of Mr. Banks? In brief and in substance, it was as follows:

"You Southern gentlemen insist that no ' man can be national, who cannot get your ' votes, and that the election of a Speaker with- ' out your votes will be an odious, sectional ' triumph. The truth is precisely the reverse. ' Nobody is national, who *can* receive your ' votes, and whoever receives your votes is, by ' that fact, proved conclusively to be a section- ' alist. YOU HAVE ESTABLISHED A SEC- ' TIONAL TEST. You put the thumb-screws ' on every man who is proposed for the Speak- ' ership, and unless he will say that he is in ' favor of, or will interpose no opposition to, ' the extension of Slavery, you vote against ' him. You stand together, a solid, compact ' body of slaveholders, always unanimous where ' the slave interest is touched. Nobody will ' be elected by your aid, except somebody in ' the interest of Slavery extension. Your tri- ' umph in electing such a man will be a sec- ' tional triumph, and doubly odious, because ' your section is a small minority. You insist ' upon a Speaker who is for extending Slavery. ' We insist upon a Speaker who is against ex- ' tending Slavery. You are united to a man. ' We are not so well united as you are, but we ' are stronger, and, with God's help, we will ' beat you. Not one inch will we budge for ' anybody's threats. Freedom *was* national, and ' Slavery *was* sectional, when the Union was ' formed, and we mean they shall continue so. ' You are a sectional faction, banded together ' for a sectional object. As you will vote for ' no man who can receive our suffrages, so we ' can vote for no man who will receive your ' suffrages, as we know very well, and you ' openly say so, that you will vote for no man ' who is not pledged, body and soul, to Slavery. ' We utterly deny your claim to nationality. ' We are the only national party, because, in ' the first place, we go for Freedom, which is ' and ought to be national, and because, in the ' second place, we represent the large majority ' of the nation."

This was the language of the Republican party during the contest for the Speakership, and every word of it is applicable to the pending contest for the Presidency. It is no objection to Col. Fremont that he can carry no slave State. We should support him as our Representatives supported Mr. Banks, for the very reasons for which the slave States oppose him.

This charge of sectionalism is a two-edged sword. If the union of the North is mad and dangerous, how will Mr. Fillmore characterize the union of the South? Does it commend Mr. Buchanan to our favor, that the vote of every single slave State is relied upon in his favor?

On the 31st of July, 1856, the Washington *Union*, the central organ of the Buchanan party, made the following announcement:

"With the 120 votes from the South, which ' Mr. Buchanan is sure of, and the 27 of Penn- ' sylvania, it needs only two votes to elect him."

If the South may combine to elect a candidate in favor of the extension of Slavery, may not the North unite in electing a candidate in opposition to it? Are the advantages of union and concert to be the exclusive monopolies of a bad cause? If the pending Presidential contest has assumed the aspect of a sectional struggle, upon whom rests the blame, and which side of the contest ought we, men of the North, to espouse? Shall we go with the South, which has provoked the contest by setting up new and odious tests, or shall we stand by our own people, our own kith and kindred, and our own institutions? With the blood yet fresh upon the soil of Kansas, of our brethren slain by the minions of slaveholding tyrants, shall we ask permission of Virginia and South Carolina to elect the man of our own choice to the Presidency? Is nobody to enter the White House, unless endorsed by the South? Is the support of the free States to be a fatal disqualification for office and honors? So it has been for long, but so is it not now, and so will it never be again. The charm of Southern invincibility was broken forever, on the day and hour when N. P. Banks ascended to the Speaker's Chair. The volume of slaveholding domination was then closed. A new era then dawned, which will ripen into perfect day, when John C. Fremont, bearing the hopes of the nation, and backed by exulting and resistless millions, shall restore the lustre of the Presidential office, and, casting the false gods of modern idolatry to the moles and to the bats, shall bring back again the true and ancient worship of Republican Liberty.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 011 898 318 A

WASHINGTON, D. C.
BUELL & BLANCHARD, PRINTERS.
1856.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 011 898 318 A